FROM: Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation,
Washington, D. C. 20590

REMARKS BY PAUL L. SITTON, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION, BEFORE COLUMBUS TRAFFIC CLUB, COLUMBUS, GEORGIA, MAY 11, 1967, 7:30 p.m.

On the first of April we opened the doors of the Department of Transportation -- the 12th Department in our Cabinet. Our new Department was created out of need and hope -- to bring together under one authority all our Federal programs and activities in air, rail and highway transportation as well as many of our Nation's water transportation programs.

The creation of this Department was hardly the result of a bureaucratic brainstorm. Ever since 1874 there has been discussion about the need for such a Department. The Congress has considered ways of coordinating the Federal interest in transportation on 17 separate occasions.

By 1966 there were 35 separate agencies which handled some form of transportation program or activity -- agencies concerned with highways and the Federal-aid program for highway construction, those which dealt with aviation and with the Coast Guard and its programs for marine safety. Others were responsible for safety and inspection programs for aircraft and railroads. Separate organizations directed the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Alaska Railroad, our maritime activities -- and in many other programs which affect the daily lives of millions of Americans. The need for closer coordination of all these programs had become urgent -- the result was the Department of Transportation.

To mark the opening of our new Department, the Smithsonian Institution arranged a celebration -- the sort of thing which is designated these days a s a "happening" -- which describes rather accurately what took place. We saw and rode in the gondola of a gas balloon and an 1880 omnibus was pulled around by mules. A hydro-skimmer built by Bell Aero Systems flew over the surface of the Mall and we saw and heard the workings of a

one-man rocket belt which for many of us captures the spirit of the ideal for the "travelling man" of the 21st century.

We in the Department are concerned with forms of transportation both older and newer than those which we saw on the Mall that day. Today's river and canal boats are descendants of man's earliest form of transport. Developmentally, the supersonic transportation which will cross our country at a speed of 1800 mph post-dates the man in the space suit.

Transportation is an activity which touches almost every daily life. Some 20% of this country's gross national product is more or less linked to our transportation industry. About 14% of all civilian employment in the United States is in the transportation field. An approximately 18 cents out of each tax dollar comes from transportation sources.

Today there are 90 million motor vehicles in the United States. By 1975 there will be almost 120 million.

Last year domestic airlines flew almost 57 billion passenger miles. By 1975 they expect to fly almost 130 billion.

In 1964, 1.5 trillion -- 1.5 thousand million -- ton miles of cargo were moved by America's transportation industry. By 1980 the industry will move almost twice that much in cargo.

Today Americans can travel on almost 3 million miles of paved roads and highways. By 1975 -- or perhaps sooner -- we shall be able to cross the country on our new Interstate Highway System. If we could find an American hardy enough to make the trip, he could go from New York to California without stopping once. It's hardly a trip designed to please American children -- but the man at the wheel could forget about traffic lights for his entire trip across the country.

The Federal Government is involved -- in some way -- in every form of transportation. During 1965 more than $5 billion in Federal support went into highway construction, into the development of our rivers and harbors, in the operation of airlines and the construction of airports as well as subsidizing our maritime industry. In shipping, for example, of our Nation's 2500 ocean-going cargo vessels, 1500 are part of the Government-owned Reserve Fleet.

But this substantial Federal investment is dwarfed by the investment of other sectors of our economy. State and local expenditures on transportation have reached some $12 billion annually.

Most important, however, is the private outlay which may be as much as $150 billion each year!

And this is the way it will continue to be.

This predominance of private over public investment in transportation is peculiarly American. In no other nation in the world does the private sector direct such a large part of transportation activities. This unique blend of public and private cooperation is one of the accomplishments of our American system.

Transportation in the United States is unique in another way. By a tacit agreement between the public and private transportation interests, the ways and means of our transport system have been more or less apportioned.

The ways -- the highways, the airlines, the water routes -- are publicly maintained and controlled. The means -- the trucks the rail passenger and freight cars, the planes, the automobiles and, and to a large extent, the busses -- are privately owned. The interdependence has been one of the strengths of our American system. We seek to preserve that strength.

Just after Alan Boyd was named by the President as the first Secretary of Transportation, he told a U.S. Chamber of Commerce group that he didn't conceive of the Department as a "big daddy" to the transportation system in our country. He said:

> "The Department will have the responsibility for encouraging and promoting our private enterprise system, rather than trying to move in the direction of taking over its actions and responsibilities . . . It must be a cooperative effort."

In the future -- as in the past -- programs to develop and improve our Nation's transportation systems will result from the initiative and enterprise of private investors. We in the Department hope to serve as a catalyst in the search for solutions to the problems which confront both private and public transportation interests.

In many cases we hope to identify the emerging problems which touch on transportation so that all of us can work together to find answers before their very complexity has rendered them well-nigh insoluble. The problems of air pollution and noise abatement which affect and hamper the daily lives of millions of Americans are the <u>sort</u> of thing we hope to anticipate. Industry and government must work jointly to find solutions to developments such as these which affect our daily lives and health, our countryside and -- let's not forget -- our pocketbooks as well.

We in the Department find all this a tremendous challenge. Our concern is not just transportation -- our duties lie beyond the movement of people and goods from one spot to another. We seek that best of all worlds in which the American transportation system will be fast, safe and convenient -- and, of course, we want it to be efficient and economical, too.

We seek a transportation system capable of anticipating the needs of tomorrow's consumers -- the users -- as well as today's. And we are concerned with the interests of the carriers, of industry as a group, of the millions of men and women who work in transportation. In addition, we cannot overlook our responsibilities in the national defense area.

At the same tine, we have another hope for transportation. We believe that it is equally important that we preserve the natural beauty of our countryside, that we conserve our recreation lands and public parks, our wildlife and waterfowl centers, and the historic sites which remind us of our American tradition and heritage.

We seek to retain the special quality of our rural environment -- and we hope that transportation can make a positive contribution to the aesthetic quality of urban life as well. In this way our transportation systems can contribute to the visual pleasure of our daily lives.

How do we propose to do all this?

To handle the problems of transportation today and to anticipate the problems of the future we have brought together under one roof -- organizationally, if not physically -- some 92,000 employees and agencies with programs involving an annual budget of almost $6 billion.

Most of these are part of on-going programs of the various agencies created over the years to serve our different forms of transportation. Now they will be brought together to operate within the framework of our single department. The Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration, the Federal Highway Administration, the Coast Guard and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation will serve the country's interest more or less as they have in the past. Each Agency's Administrator and the Coast Guard Commandant will continue to serve as the advocate for the mode of transportation which he directs.

If we think of America's future in terms of continuing growth -- growing population, growing consumer needs -- we must look to our railroads and their ability to serve as a conveyor belt of the goods which our Nation requires.

Our railroads have a potential-capacity so great that it almost exceeds human comprehension.

To continue about the Department of Transportation structure -- within the Department at the assistant secretarial level, we shall deal across the board with the effort to improve present systems and to create a national system of transportation. Our assistant secretaries will advise the Secretary on public affairs, on international transportation, on policy development and on research and technology. These men -- the assistant secretaries -- are not going to promote either aviation or inland waterways or trucklines -- or any other single mode of transportation. They and the Departmental staff of 400 -- very small -- by Washington standards, at least -- will examine and evaluate the needs of all modes of transportation within the framework of the Nation's overall requirements.

In this way we hope that we shall avoid undue emphasis on any one form of transport in preference to any other.

Ours is not a regulatory agency.

The ICC, the CAB and the Federal Maritime Commission will continue as before in providing economic regulation. Their continuing responsibility involves protecting both the public and the private interests as they are served by our motor and water carriers, our railroads, our freight forwarders -- and also in those of our airlines, our pipelines and the Nation's ocean-going ships.

Let me say here parenthetically that when President Johnson recommended that the Congress create a Department of Transportation, he proposed the Maritime Administration as a logical component of the Department. We consider it unfortunate that it is still a separate agency and hope that Congress will soon see fit to make Maritime a part of our interdependent transport effort. Land transportation does not stop at the railroad siding -- we think that the Nation's interests could be better served if it did not stop at dockside.

Another Departmental concern is safety and the safety functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board have been transferred to the National Transportation Safety Board.

The Board was established as a result of the grave concern across our Nation about our mounting toll of traffic accidents.

During 1965, 49,000 Americans died as the result of motor vehicle accidents.

Another 1300 were killed in aircraft accidents and 1500 more in ship and boat accidents.

2300 more lost their lives in accidents involving railroads.

Millions more were injured -- chiefly in accidents involving motor vehicles.

Aside from the heartbreak and pain which these accidents left in their wake, auto accidents alone are responsible for an annual financial loss of several billion dollars in terms of property damage and man-hours lost.

It is a shocking waste of human resources.

The Department hopes to make a comprehensive attack on the problems of traffic safety. For the first time, a single government agency will be able to focus its attention on this critical national problem. We may find one solution by adapting the tested techniques of safety in one field to another. Techniques of automoble safety, for example, may benefit from research into air safety just as we have seen a remarkable improvement in automobile accident statistics since the introduction of a simple device like the seat belt -- which was originally devised for the use of aircraft passengers.

What of our plans for the near future?

I have already mentioned our safety programs -- in this area there are hopes for real accomplishments.

The supersonic transport test models have been ordered -- we hope that the first of them will be in the air by 1970. Our SST is designed to carry from 300 to 500 passengers in a plane longer than a football field -- it will be the world's largest and fastest.

We are deeply involved in the problem of noise abatement -- especially the noise from aircraft.

The Northeast Corridor demonstration project will be underway this summer -- our first rapid-rail program -- designed to cut down on travel time between Boston, New York and Washington. We hope that research will lead us to other advanced ground transportation systems in a short time.

The Department hopes to play a significant role in strengthening urban transportation planning -- we think that the quality of transportation can be improved if we go beyond questions of service to think of it also in terms of its social impact upon the lives of city dwellers.

We hope that the Department will make a real contribution in efforts to increase efficiency between the different modes of transportation. We plan to promote intermodal systems including, of course, lending our support to containerization programs. We believe that these offer the prospect of another form of transportation revolution -- one in which a relatively small-scale investment may result in quick and practical improvements of freight and cargo handling.

Today we seek progress and order.

The American people want -- they deserve -- they need -- a transportation system which gives the greatest service to the greatest number.

Speed is not the only answer -- look at the tortoise and the hare.

Economy is not always the primate consideration -- a straight highway across the heart of a city might destory much that is picturesque and historically irreplaceable, much that was the character of the city which it buries under a concrete ribbon.

Avoiding accidents is not the only consideration -- we might have to abandon all forms of transportation -- and become a walking society and a stagnant economy, if it were.

And if the total convenience of the individual were to prevail, something would have to give somewhere. Actually, a lot of things would have to give and -- to paraphrase P.T. Barnum -- we still wouldn't have please all of the people all of the time.

No -- ourforms of transportation are like our society -- interdependent, serving each other singly and together. Transportation works well in America today but we in the new Department hope that it can be made to work even better -- for all of the people and all of the systems, tomorrow and in 1975 and in the year 2000.

By then, 30 million acres of America's cities and countryside will be devoted to the paths taken by our different means of transport -- in railroad rights-of-way, in highways and their rights-of-way, in airports and airstrips.

That's an area 40 times the size of your Columbus Metropolitan Area* -- an area 5/6 the size of the State of Georgia -- all of it devoted to systems for taking the American people and the goods they need somewhere -- and in bringing them back again.

I find this a sobering notion.

We in the Department of Transportation find ours a sobering responsibility but one which is filled with challenge for today and hope for tomorrow, as well.

Thank you.

* Muscogee, Chattachoochee Counties in Georgia and Russell County (Phenix City), Alabama

104.3

REMARKS BY PAUL L. SITTON
DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PANEL ON "NEW APPROACHES AND
INSTRUMENTS FOR PUBLIC INTERVENTION"

1968 CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN SOCIETY
OF PLANNING OFFICIALS, MAKING PLANNING RELEVANT:
IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING URBAN DILEMMAS

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
9:00 A.M., MAY 7, 1968

We are here today to discuss how processes for planning and for allocating this Nation's resources can be made more meaningful and more relevant to the problems of an increasingly complex urban society.

Your program speaks of the need for identifying and resolving urban dilemmas. According to the Webster's which I use, a dilemma involves "a choice between equally unfavorable or disagreeable alternatives." I am enough of an optimist to question the premise that this is what we face. Positive and acceptable alternatives to solve today's urban problems can, I am sure, be found -- at least in the development of transportation systems of the future -- the urban sector with which I am concerned.

In spite of flamboyant descriptions of our adversities, we continue to share a heritage -- abundance, optimism, dedication, compassion, and a dream of a rich and full life.

S-2 # 0397 6-26-69

SITPL680507 00233

Yet, we witness what is truly the 20th Century paradox -- poverty in the midst of prosperity, slums in the midst of riches, restlessness in a secure society.

Half a century ago, H.G. Wells wrote that "In England we have come to rely on a comfortable time-lag of fifty years or a century intervening between the perception that something ought to be done and a serious attempt to do it." There are those who believe that such a condition is inherent in the often evolutionary process of a democracy. Time and again we have heard it stated that democratic government is a luxury which only the most affluent nation can afford.

Today this luxury is threatened here -- despite our affluence. As an example, any complacency we might have about future demands on our resources and talents should be shattered by contemplation of the forecasts of an impending population explosion.

Thousands of years passed from the beginning of civilization until 33 B.C. when the world's population reached 200 to 300 million. It took more than 1600 years for this population to double and reach 500 million. But during the next 200 years, from 1650 until 1850, the world population doubled again to one billion. In the

next 100 years, from 1850 to 1960, it tripled reaching 3 billion. And between 1960 and the year 2000, a period of only 40 years, the world population is estimated to more than double again to ranges of 7 billion. More than two people for every one that is alive today.

Staggering as the prospect may be, the demand for services is complicated by more than increasing population. Affluence is increasing, expectations are growing even more rapidly, and demands for more and better services are outpacing everything else.

Along with this phenomenal expansion of population and prosperity, we are confronted by the accelerating pace of technology and increasing social mobility, which combine to produce a dis-equilibrium and disorder of great significance to our society.

This is the time of contradiction and alienation.

--Technology's advance has heightened the prosperity of many; it has deepened the poverty of others.

--Accelerating change and increasing expectations have nurtured affluence; they can also lead to frustration and bitterness to those who see but cannot share in this age of instant communi-cation.

--The permissiveness in which today's generation was raised has led to a lack of self discipline which is in conflict with the restraint which a sophisticated and highly organized society demands.

We seek plans which will rationalize the contradictions of today, which will anticipate the demands of tomorrow, which will correct the mistakes of yesterday. Utopian programs planned for the Year 2000, alone will not do.

Secretary Boyd warned the League of Cities last year that "We must not postpone decisions now because we hope for perfect solutions, better planning or improved technology in the future. The French have a saying that 'the best is the enemy of the good.' I think this is relevant for us. We need action programs today to solve the problems of today . . . "

There are those who consider this reliance on trial and error as an approach to planning highly unorthodox.

Transportation, in particular, is a sector in which we must begin today to better use existing instruments, for planning, for development, for action now.

A 1965 study of the District of Columbia's transportation planning process aroused controversy when it suggested that emphasis be given to satisfying immediate rather than ultimate transportation objectives.

It suggested that the community undertake freeway and rapid transit construction programs on an incremental basis rather than making what the report called "massive irrevocable commitments." Such incremental development offered a double advantage -- that of meeting an existing need and that of adjusting and adapting development programs to changing needs and changing technologies which might emerge later. This approach provides the building blocks for meeting future requirements.

The inadequacies of the planning process are only part of the impediments to progress. We are confronted too often with an archaic complex of political and governmental structures with intertwining responsibilities for the administration of transportation programs. Programs serving education, water, welfare and health, appear to proliferate governmental and administrative units. The effectiveness of programs in promoting the individual's search for the good life as well as the demands of the community as an entity, are hampered by anachronistic institutions at every level of government. These difficulties are also often further exaggerated by well intentioned but parochial bureaucracies.

Frequently we do not know which institution should do what, much less which should pay for it. Political responsibility is fragmental among local, county, state and federal governments. Functional responsibility often is divided in literally hundreds of ways across the lines of political responsibility with governments entering into agreements with a myriad of special tax districts, administrations and authorities. Often these authorities have a high order of autonomy in which each goes its own way spending money and fails to respond to demands of the electorate. And even Washington is not exempt from this chaos. Planning and grant authority touching on some aspect of urban life is vested in practically every major government agency. Federal oversight over urban affairs is often dispersed among uncoordinated commitees.

We are also confronted with another significant weakness -- the irrationality of tax structures at various levels of government. A significant imbalance can be created in a federal system in which a progressive central tax system competes at an advantage over often regressive systems which prevail at a local level.

Under this system and with the restrictions placed by state laws upon local governments, the cities are not able to collect the needed revenues for financing ever increasing services that are demanded by their citizens. The long term implications of this situation are ominous. Without a revision in tax policies I am afraid that the result will be ever increasing centralization of governmental responsibility at the federal level. This means an ever widening gap between the decision makers and the people on whom decisions have their greatest impact. Thus the direct participation of citizens in the processes of government diminishes resulting in increasing alienation between the government and the governed.

The manner in which the federal government prescribes how the grant assistance can be used has inherent weaknesses in which the planning and decision making process of the local official is invariably distorted. Why should a local decision maker, as an example, seriously explore alternative solutions if there is one solution whereby federal finance support relieves him of responsibility for seeking additional local revenues to finance his programs.

Our system of government will retreat from its original purpose if our cities lose the responsibility for planning their

future development. Washington cannot design the form and quality of tomorrow's city. Thus federal programs and state programs of assistance as well must be made available in a sufficiently neutral framework which will promote this objective.

The Department of Transportation is sensitive to these issues and has given priority to a search for alternative approaches whereby federal transportation programs will constructively assist the cities in strengthening their own responses to today's needs, to those which may arise tomorrow and in the decades to come.

In 1966, President Johnson asked the Congress to establish a Department of Transportation which might bring together all the means for moving people and goods. The relevance of this Presidential directive is the conviction that one Department, administering the previously fragmented federal programs in transportation must coalesce these programs into a single, integrated system approach to transportation problems. Ultimately, the movement of people and goods in a metropolitan area is a problem not only of speed, monetary cost and efficiency, but, as well, a problem of air pollution and noise, of displacement and neighborhood disruption, of economic viability and of welfare considerations. It is a problem that involves the paramount needs and goals of people rather than solely the mechanics of providing

transport facilities and services. Transportation is no end in itself but a subordinate service for meeting broader community goals.

May 7 can mark another significant step in this direction. If Congress gives its tacit approval today to the President's request to transfer the Urban Mass Transit program to the Department of Transportation, the mechanism for coordination urban transportation support will be further strengthened. The placement of the transit program, and the highway and airport programs in one Cabinet-level agency will provide an institutional framework that has been badly needed.

A parallel strengthening of the Department of Housing and Urban Development role in promoting comprehensive planning -- including comprehensive transportation planning -- is also needed to assure that investments in transportation are consistent with sound urban development.

The strong statement of Congressional intent in the Department of Transportation Act for such program coordination requires a close working relationship between these two Cabinet Departments. You may be assured that the two Secretaries have established as a high priority the development of standards,

criteria, rules and procedures to assure that transportation will be fully related to urban development goals.

I will not pretend that incorporating all urban transportation programs in one agency will automatically provide for an integrated and balanced approach. You know, as well as I do, that there still remain certain built-in impediments to this result. Not the least of these is the significant discrepancy in the levels of financial support available for the various federal urban transportation programs and the differing grant matching shares required. These are long term problems of resource allocation on which the Department will focus in the months ahead. But we should not allow their existence to obscure the fact that the President's Reorganization Plan has made the tools at our disposal enormously more effective.

In writing about the condition of the American city in crisis, Urban America recently wrote that "highways are the most powerful and the most permanent of public works; the Roman roads did more than Michelangelo to give the city its form, and they are still there to see and use."

Across the Nation in recent years, cities and citizens

have found themselves participating in a new form of urban advocacy -- the Freeway Fight.

We have recently begun to realize that some of the crises of urban highway development can be corrected. There are alternative means by which cities can meet their pressing congestion problems, other than by singular reliance on massive new highway construction.

Over the last year and a half the Federal Highway Administration has initiated a program whereby communities can improve the utilization of existing highways and streets in conjunction with the construction of new ones. In this experimental program the states are being encouraged to use a portion of their federal-aid highway fund to improve traffic control and surveillance systems, add left-turn lanes, build pedestrian overpasses, construct special turn-out areas where trucks can loan and unload, establish special bus lanes, and eliminate safety hazards.

What we have seen of this program so far has been most encouraging, but is has moved slowly because of the reluctance to use funds for this purpose as an alternative to construction of new facilities. Last week, as part of a comprehensive legislative

package the Administration proposed that a $250 million program be established to assist states and cities in improving traffic operations on urban streets and highways.

We are confident that when authorized by the Congress, these funds will give impetus to the use of a tool which has not been adequately exploited in the past.

The environmental consequences of transportation facility location also have received special attention as a major priority in developmental goals. In recent years, Americans have become increasingly aware of the need to conserve our resources and to protect our environment from the further ravages of men, machines and technology. The result has been new programs dealing with water resources, with water and air pollution, with natural beauty, with historic preservation. Institutions have been created in response to a demand for public intervention in planning and allocation of resources so that our posterity may enjoy a physical environment of livable quality.

In creating the Department of Transportation, the Congress took specific steps to protect the nation's heritage from the adverse impact of transportation.

First of all, it declared a national policy that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside; public park, and recreation lands; waterfowl and wildlife refuges; and historic sites.

And, secondly, it enjoined the Secretary of Transportation from approving any program or project which might use land from such areas unless -- and this is the language of the Act -- "there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land" and unless such programs minimized the harm which they might do to such land areas.

You will hear a great deal about Sections 2(b)(2) and 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act. They are important federal policy tools, major instruments for public intervention in the decision-making process concerning the impact of transportation programs on the environment. Notwithstanding this authority, however, the federal government cannot carry the program of preserving the environment alone. If the citizen, the city, the county, or the state is unconcerned about these environmental impact problems, the federal government cannot unilaterally take up the cause with any real effectiveness.

Somewhat related to this has been the inability of the planning process to tie down these broad environmental considerations at the program formulation stage. This manifestation is of particular relevance to the activities of professional planners, of public officials, and of civic leaders -- to all of us who are gathered here today. We have seen numerous instances of ad hoc planning to correct this deficiency. I suggest that its use reflects, in part, the failure of the formal planning process to respond to a democratic society's demands. A basic flaw in planning as an art is revealed by this seemingly increasing need to undertake decisions outside the planning process, by-passing or ignoring those public bodies and institutions which should be making such decisions.

There has often been a gap between planning and specific implementation of highway and transit development programs in our urban areas. Too often broad brush urban transportation planning proposals are implemented without sufficient detailed urban design studies to insure that the plan fits the real world at the neighborhood level. The macroscopic planning process does not cope sufficiently with the environmental, social and economic implications and opportunities that are generated by new highways, block by block.

In Baltimore today we are watching with great interest the work of an urban design team which is, in effect, an ad hoc accommodation to this insufficiency of the formal planning process.

Baltimore's urban design team and its approach has been hailed as a bold and creative step toward the integration of the highway in the city. It has also been called a brilliant make-shift. And it has also been called indisputable evidence of the failure of the planning process.

The urban highway design teams are a logical outgrowth of the dialogue between the cities, states and federal government over how to reconcile highways with the cities.

Let me tell you how this has come about.

Forty years ago many states were precluded from using state money in cities with population of more than 5000; federal highway programs incorporated similar limitations which were not eased until the 1940's. But it was not until the passage of the 1956 Highway Act that substantial federal funds were provided for such programs and federal, state and city officials could come together to discuss new approaches to the planning for interstate

highways in urban areas. It was 1962 before the basic framework for today's urban highway design teams was set forth in recommendation by the Hershey, Pennsylvania Conference.

Essentially, this framework provides for teamwork in freeway planning and design from the outset with participation by municipal agencies, highway engineers, city planners, architects and other specialists. The teams participate in the earliest decisions concerning features such as the highway's location and its alignment. The essential community consensus is sought from the beginning by outlining in a graphic way the full implication of decisions of facility locations and providing a clearer picture of the alternatives. This to me represents a constructive step of keeping the public fully informed on decisions that significantly affect its future way of living.

In 1965 at a conference in Williamsburg on urban planning and freeway locations, refinements of the planning processes were developed to meet social and environmental problems which were delaying urban highway programs. The conference recognized the need for identifying and evaluating urban values and goals as integral to the comprehensive transportation planning process. Shortly thereafter the Bureau of Public Roads planners suggested

that multiple use of right-of-way facilities to accommodate housing, recreational and industrial facilities as part of proposed freeways offered new vistas for urban development.

These new approaches to highway planning in urban areas quite naturally led to the interdisciplinary urban design teams which are working today in Baltimore and in Chicago. The Secretary of Transportation has supported strongly this experimental total concept approach to the problems of urban development. Involvement of all federal, state and local agencies is essential in this effort and should include not only the highway but also other transportation, housing, recreational and open space projects, schools, and employment centers. The highway program can be the catalyst that pulls these programs together into a joint development project. If properly coordinated this approach may provide the instrument for shaping urban designs of the future.

In Baltimore, agreement on the corridor which the interstate highway was to use had been reached only after a long and bitter dispute. The controversy involved citizens, the city, the state, those who were concerned about the preservation of some of Baltimore's historic assets, and those whose homes would be demolished in the path of the steamrollers and the cement trucks. The team approach

was adopted in Baltimore only as a last and desperate measure, a way to make the best out of the bad situation which this particular highway through this particular city had created.

There are other problems involving the urban highway's impact which must corrected.

The Department is supporting proposals to minimize the effect upon homeowners, tenants, businessmen and farmers of inequities which now occur when land is acquired for use in any federal or federally-assisted construction program.

For example, the concept of fair-market value does not meet the problem of the occupant-owner whose property is taken from him. Often he cannot find decent, safe and sanitary alternative housing at a comparable price.

Or, the inequities arising from the lack of uniformity of compensatory practices among the various states and particularly that which often exists among the several construction programs of the federal government within the same state.

Too often in urban areas, and even more often when the

displaced people are poor, relocation assistance has no meaning. Individuals, and particularly families of low and moderate income just cannot find housing which is decent, safe, and sanitary, and which is at least as desirable as that which they have been forced to leave.

The current proposals would greatly alleviate these inequities which frequently bear so heavily on those whose homes and businesses are displaced so that others may move more quickly across the city to their homes and their jobs.

These are just a few of the new measures which are available today or which we hope will become available in the near future. These are instruments which can be used to correct the shortcomings which exist in the function of transportation in urban areas today and to point to the way to prevent the repetition of these deficiencies in cities of the future.

Transportation is a vital element in an urban society, one which has enormous implications for the current and projected quality of the urban fabric which extends far beyond its primary function of moving people and goods.

Decisions about transportation are decisions about the future form and organization of the city. Recognition of transportation's role is essential. And once it is recognized, citizens, planners, and public officials at every level, must seek to use transportation and to use it wisely and well to serve the needs of society today and in anticipation of the demands of society tomorrow.

Remarks by Paul L. Sitton, Administrator of Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Prepared for Delivery Before Meeting of the Forward Thrust Committee of the Whole Panel on "Alternate Modes of Public Transportation", Snoqualmie Room, Seattle Center, October 19, 1968

Seattle, Washington

Within our lifetime we have seen the stereotype of "American Gothic" change from the farmer with his pitchfork in front of his barn to that of a man with a briefcase standing in front of a high rise apartment or office building. Ours has become an urban society and the numbers of people and the degree of urbanization increase with each year.

And with this increasing urbanization, cities and metropolitan areas across the nation are confronted with increasing demands for services. And they are confronted with increasing demands for the support and the guidance which will enable them to develop new solutions to ameliorate---or better still resolve---the financial, political and environmental problems which are one part of the urban blight.

Transportation is an integral part of both what is wrong and what is right in urban America. I am here today to talk to you about the role of transportation ---particularly mass transportation---and even more particularly, transit, and the ways in which we can use it as a force for contributing to what is right in the city of today and in the cities of tomorrow.

In 1963, President John F. Kennedy outlined the problems of transportation which have developed along with urban growth and the changes in America's urgan society. He talked of higher incomes and the increasing availability of automobiles which made it possible for American families to move to the suburbs. He spoke of the changes in

movement of freight made possible by modern highways and trucking techniques which have reduced dependence on yesterday's centralized freight operations. He spoke of new construction techniques which have enabled business and industry to move to spacious one-story plants in outlying areas.

But most important, he pointed out, has been the decline in the importance of central cities and the resultant change in urban travel patterns. This has, in part, been responsible for some of the problems of existing mass transportation facilities, few of which are geared to accommodate all of the demands of travel in today's urban areas. And President Kennedy also pointed out---and it was hardly news over five years ago---the difficulties which increasing use of automobiles and increasing automobile congestion have made for mass transportation facilities which use---or try to use---the same highways and streets.

President Kennedy underscored what the result had been---"impaired effectiveness and economic viability of public mass transportation" and "a steady decline in patronage and a concomitant rise of unprofitability and financial problems."

In 1900, approximately 40 percent of this nation's population---then 76 million---lived in urban areas.

By 1960, 70 percent of Americans were urban dwellers.

By 2000, only 31 years from now, our population will have burgeoned to 330 million---four times that of 1900, almost twice that of 1960---85 percent of all American s will be living in urban areas. And most of

those Americans will be living in urban complexes far greater than those which we know today. Those millions of Americans will demand newer and more efficient means for moving around their cities, their metropolitan areas.

Barbara Ward, the distinguished British economist and critic of contemporary society, has dramatized what she calls "the sheer physical limits set to any reliance on cars alone," by pointing out that "In the New York metropolitan region it is estimated that if every bridge, tunnel and freeway were doubled in capacity and the center of the city given over to as much road and parking space as central Los Angeles.... only 22 percent of all commuters could come and go by private car."

And so, many Americans have come to accept what President Kennedy has also said: "Our national welfare requires the provision of good urban transportation, with the properly balanced use of private vehicles and modern mass transport to help shape as well as serve urban growth."

In 1967 President Johnson asked Congress to create a Department of Transportation to bring together the thousands of men and programs which serve and support the movement of people and goods across the nation and across the world.

Three months ago many of the urban mass transportation programs which had been the responsibility of Housing and Urban Development were transferred to the Department of Transportation. We consider this

transfer of urban mass transportation functions to DOT a truly significant event.

First of all, as a part of the Department of Transportation, UMTA is established as an operating administration with organizational rank and importance equal to that of the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration and the Federal Railroad Administration. And for the first time, there is Federal recognition of the right of the urban transportation voice to be heard. And there is recognition of urban mass transportation's right to equal time in considerations about transportation policy at the Federal level.

Secondly, this reorganization has clarified the channels of communication between local governments and the Federal establishment. Here is a case where Seattle is perhaps a national exception in transportation expertise. I am sure you realize that probably no other city in the country has a mayor as deeply involved in the consideration of urban transportation as Seattle's Dorn Braman.

But today, mayors of other cities, not so familiar as Mayor Braman with the way the Federal-State-local relationship works---or the way it should work---know where to seek help. For the first time a mayor can turn to one place, to the Department of Transportation and can be assured that one man, the Secretary, has Federal authority for assisting with his transportation problems. Not just his community's highway problems,

or just its rapid transit problems, or just its bus problem, or its airport problem, or its freight problems----but all its transportation problems.

And finally, it is perhaps most significant because it means that if proper funding is available---whether Federal, local or private---for mass transportation solutions to a community, community planners are learning that they have a transportation choice---an option other than the urban highway. Why? Because no longer are highways the only solution to a city's transportation and congestion problems for which dollars, especially Federal dollars, are available.

These are promising times for those of us who have watched the frequent and bitter highway controversies which have rent so many American cities. For the first time, there is an opportunity to offer cities and the people who live in cities an alternative to the highway which, at the same time, promises to make more efficient and effective use of those highways which already exist.

In many cities which have considered rapid transit as an alternative to highways, there have emerged certain volunteer evaluators who have opportunely condemned proposals for rapid transit system development. Many of them question what they call "the economic justification for a transit system . . ."

I shall not attempt to refute these unofficial critics. In fact, neither the process of reckoning nor the figures by which their conclusion was reached are really of much importance. They are certainly not decisive.

They are not important because the economic question itself affords an inadequate basis for the key decision: "Should a rail rapid transit be constructed?"

That central question cannot be answered fairly and satisfactorily by attending only to the economics of the project. The citizens of any city considering such proposals must ask and answer a whole series of questions relating to the kind of place they want their city to be. What kind of life do they want to live? What social, aesthetic, educational, religious and economic activities and values do they wish to foster? And finally, what kind of transportation system will serve these broad objectives most satisfactorily?

Many elements of such a decision cannot be reduced to dollars, whether costs or benefits. Indeed, some of these costs and benefits cannot be quantified at all. They are matters of feeling, of judgment, of desire, and the community and its citizens must take responsibility for making the judgments and the decisions which they call for.

Too often in the past, transportation decisions have been based on traditional studies of "needs". Planners have devised elaborate formulae to forecast how many travelers would "desire" to go from here to there at some future date. And, to almost no one's surprise, in the case of urban highways, the "desires" projected always justify the construction of still more highways. I question whether a projected "desire" for a

highway need always lead to a public mandate to respond with another highway. And I suggest that the traveler's future desire should be projected against other community needs and values---the need for parks and open spaces, the need for a sound city tax base, the need to preserve stable and functioning neighborhoods, the need for urban diversity.

We must think of the community as a whole, not just for travelers, or workers, or children, but for all of them. Then we shall be in a position to make community decisions---including transportation decisions---so that each thing which is added to the community---whether highway or subway, whether school or park, makes it a better place than the city which would have resulted from another alternative.

U. S. Department of Transportation
Urban Mass Transportation Administration
Washington, D. C.

Remarks by Paul L. Sitton, Administrator of Urban Mass Transportation Administration, at Meeting of Washington and Baltimore Members of the American Institute of Planners on October 21, 1968, Columbia, Maryland

Change, choice and mobility created the modern metropolis. They are also its nemesis.

Once industry brought production out of the fields into city barracks and lofts and once manufacturing split up into thousands of different specialization, the great city began to grow. Workers had to live near their work and managers needed quick access to each others' concerns.

Economy and convenience dictated the early centralization. They underlie much of it today, too, but nearness and access have wholly different meanings in the age of the train, plane, automobile and communications satellite.

The pattern of increasing urban density began to peak about 100 years ago when the train and then the car brought increased mobility and, hence, greater choice and set in motion a new cycle of change.

People with better incomes began the escape from the dirty, work-worn, overcrowded yet expensive city center to the ever-widening suburban ring. And then came the second outward wave of shops

following the shoppers, of industry needing more space and offices now able to keep in touch with others by telephone.

Both these movements of residence and work have created the metropolitan pattern of today--a spread city with its dense urban core, its satellite dormitories, its scattered shops and services, its lifelines of road and rail, and its often vestigial open spaces covering a hundred or more square miles of built-up territory. And now these metropolitan areas are beginning to overlap into vast areas or strips of conurbation--megalopolis.

Mobility is the medium of modern urban life: whether it is the physical mobility of the day's journeys or the social mobility of a would-be equal society or the psychological mobility of educated, increasingly affluent citizens who ask questions, look for new goods and forget old pieties.

We can best analyze the needs, hopes and failures of the modern city in terms of these interrelated factors of growth, mobility and choice, for they have made the urban pattern what it is. Their pressures are inexorably increasing and, unchanged and undirected, by the end of the century they could produce widespread breakdown. This risk looms greater when we remember

that by the year 2000 at least 50% of humanity--which will have doubled in size--will live in cities of more than 100, 000 population.

In the United States today more than 65% of the population lives in areas over 50, 000 (SMSA's) on 11% of the Nation's land area, and one half in areas of 100, 000 or more (up from one third in 1920).

Even if fertility in the U. S. continues to decline, population will grow to 325 million by the year 2000. This increase of 125 million is equal to the total urban population today. This is the growth that will have to be jammed in and around existing urban areas.

But the problem is not simply a matter of absorbing these new multitudes into urban areas. Existing urban areas are already congested to the point of suffocation. They do not properly serve even their present purpose. Our urban areas must grow, but they must also be transformed. And this is the scale of the urban revolution we face.

What went wrong? Choice and mobility may have shaped the modern metropolis, but in many ways the pattern that has emerged frustrates both choice and mobility now--and threatens worse restrictions for tomorrow.

While most modern city dwellers are better off than their Victorian forebears, it could be argued that modern evils and inconveniences are equally brutal when compared to today's unprecendented affluence. These turn precisely on the frustration of that mobility and choice which we demand as a first priority in our city and in our way of life.

Mobility and choice are interdependent. Obviously the city offers richness of choice and variety only if citizens have access to them. There is no need to remind you that the present structure of cities with their congested working centers and ever-spending dormitories frustrate the ideal of easy access. We see peak densities on the journey to and from work exhusting the users of both public and private transportation and on weekends nearly equal densities jam the escape routes to sea or mountains.

And these obstacles to physical mobility imposed by the structure of the modern city affect all its citizens, not just the bedroom suburbanite. This structure imposes even deeper and more damaging immobilities on smaller groups--the poor who remain or arrive in the core area when the more affluent have moved on. When racial differences are added to

poverty, these residents are literally trapped in ghettos and deprived of accessible work, since housing is segregated in the newer suburban areas while service jobs which can absorb the semi-skilled have followed the incomes out to the suburbs.

A poverty from which there is no escape perpetuates poverty, lack of knowledge, lack of skill--and lack of hope for the children. It should be no surprise that violence erupts from such despair.

But the total deprivation of the ghetto is not the only social starvation which grows out of immobility. Many suburbs have the same quality of depletion: one-class, one-income, one-age group--and during weekdays, for the most part, one-sex. This bland uniformity belies the urban promise of variety and choice. Immobility also breeds the fears that are fed by ignorance and exclusion, the aimless violence of delinquency and now the anarchism of the young.

Cities built only to work or sleep in--drab, uniform, continuous--are prisons of resentment and frustration. If the oncoming millions of new citizens are simply crammed into this traditional mould, we face the certainty of a further decline in urban quality, more sprawl at the edges, more violence and decay at the core, more frustration along the roadways, less access to non-urban areas, and further mega-

lopolitan overlap. Everywhere choice and mobility will be distorted and lessened by the pressures of uncoordinated growth.

Is there any hope of meeting the double challenge of the urban revolution? I believe there is hope--and it is particularly appropriate to discuss it in this place--Columbia, Maryland, --with this audience of planners. In this combination lies one of the solutions and the principle means for reaching other solutions.

I believe we can absorb the new multitudes and transform today's cities through a creative partnership between Federal, State and local governments. Such a partnership can

--stimulate vision and choice in community values,

--identify and develop options and alternatives, and

--respond vigorously to redevelopment or new development plans.

Every phase will require the expertise of the professional planner.

I realize that this expression of hope implies a fundmental assumption--that the present pattern of urban development with all its frustrations does not represent the fulfillment of man's search for the good life. Today's attachment to the split-level suburban home on plot of

green, two-cars, hours of rugged commuting, the housewife's day as chauffeur and goods mover, does not reflect a positive choice, but is the only available escape from greater evils at the core of the city. I do not say that the suburbanite has acted irrationally in the face of the choices available, but only that thus far we have failed to provide him a better alternative--one which responds to the great vision of richness and variety which are possible.

I believe that Columbia stands as one example of where the answer lines. The genuine "new town" -- whether located within a present city as part of the transformation or on the fringe of a metropolitan area or even in a wide open area -- represents a positive alternative to planned or unplanned sprawl. It is economically self-sufficient and it offers the variety and choice made possible by modern technology and the breakdown of artificial barriers between people. In Columbia, we see variety and choice in design, structure and life style. It is human in scale and it is served by the mobility offered by the automobile, rather than being its victim.

I believe this alternative will appeal to the higher vision of people -- it will succeed in the marketplace. I am encouraged

by the success of Columbia so far, and will join in efforts to continue this success as a public testing ground of the alternative to bedroom suburbs.

What is your role as planners in meeting the challenge of the urban revolution?

First, as citizens with special training and a working knowledge of the urban problem, you have a special responsibility to identify the irrationality of present trends and mobilize an awareness of them and their alternatives.

Second, as professionals, your special training and skills must be brought to bear in finding new alternatives, identifying the effects of present trends and of proposed alternatives, explaining the implicit cost or doing nothing, and in translating inarticulate hopes and fears into meaningful proposals.

These functions give you a unique role -- stimulus to the public conscience, inventors of new visions, coalesceor of community interests, and technician of implementation. But it should be obvious that these roles demand a deep involvement in the political process -- a fact I think you all face and accept as the challenge of your position.

Your national conferences -- including that last week in Pittsburgh -- suggest that, like the adolescent, the planning

profession undergoes a perpetual identity crisis.

But I think you're on the right track in realizing that what you've been doing all along is advocacy planning for the establishment and that major conflicting interests have been excluded from the process. Your concern today for providing mechanisms to identify and articulate these interests and to enable their effective participation simply recognizes that the political process is as much an adversary proceeding in which interested parties need professional advice, as is a legal proceeding in court. You are those professionals.

What about the role of the Federal government?

First, we owe you planners adequate support and recognition of your part of the process. We do this by providing financial support for the planning process, by stimulating the use of methods to assure effective participation by all interests, and by encouraging processes for achieving effective political decision and implementation.

Second, we can stimulate the solution of technological obstacles to the achievement of urban restructuring and the housing of the new--and old--multitudes.

This involves developing new means of transportation and new ways to eliminate the need for transportation, new housing concepts and construction methods and improved urban design and administration. Both we in DOT and others in HUD are working on these areas and we are trying to stimulate the private market to attack them as well.

Third, we can provide assistance in overcoming some of the difficulties of actually developing new towns--land assembly, financing, design and provision of infrastructure, bureaucratic roadblocks. We already have mechanisms for helping with some of these, the new Housing Act gives us a new one, and we will gladly attack any new problems that you planners or developers can identify for us.

And finally, we ourselves must refrain from either inadvertantly or fatalistically assuming that future growth will occur in the same mold as the past and that nothing can or will be done to restructure and humanize our cities. It would be easy for such assumptions to creep into our planning of future highway or transit programs or housing proposals.

But unless we in the government share your vision and keep your faith that a better urban form can and will be developed, and unless we act on this basis, the promise of this better alternative will never materialize.

I believe that in partnership we can meet the urban revolution. We look to you planners--acting as both professionals and as individual citizens--for the expression of the highest hopes and aspirations of man and their embodiment in plans for restructured cities. For our part we will try to remember that transportation is not an end in itself and that our assistance is aimed in making possible those expressions of man's higher purpose.

80195

100

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Washington, D. C.

106.20

Remarks by Paul L. Sitton, Administrator of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Prepared for Delivery before the Fourth International Conference on Urban Transportation, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, March 12, 1969.

Four years ago a farsighted organization here in Pittsburgh sponsored a conference to dramatize the transportation plight of our cities. Today we are participating in the closing session of this Fourth International Conference on Urban Transportation and looking forward to the Fifth.

It is particularly significant because you of the Pittsburgh Urban Transit Council and we in the United States Department of Transportation for the first time have joined together to make a reality of the Conference theme--that transportation is a lifeline of an urban society.

The theme of this Conference and the subjects of the past three days' sessions have underscored the true social significance of urban transportation as a contributor to our well-being and the creation of a better life.

Transportation is a necessary condition for the accomplishment of our urban goals without which we will never be able to cope with urban unrest, to create socially useful jobs, to expand the educational opportunities of our youth, to rebuild deteriorating neighborhoods, or to make available the recreational outlets that are vital in an urban society.

6-27-69

#1244.

7-2

00330

~~00330~~ 00330

SITTPL690312

The search for answers to urban transportation problems is merely part of the search for assuring to all urban Americans of all ages and all economic levels the opportunities to enjoy the benefits of our Nation's unprecedented prosperity.

My participation in this program has been listed as a progress report on urban transit programs. Instead, I would like to discuss some of the practical realities of life in urban America that underlie many of the current inadequacies of public transportation. They are the urgent problems that confront all levels of government as well as the business community. In fact, the development of new transport systems to serve urban America more adequately in the future is totally dependent on their solution.

I refer to the diminishing financial capability of our great cities to meet increasing needs for public services. I also refer to obsolete municipal governmental structures which too often lack the legal and administrative power to shape decisively the economic, political and social development of our important metropolitan centers.

I raise the question of whether the Federal Government will expand its financial support in further promotion of the policies enunciated in the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Legislation already introduced at this session of the Congress to create an urban mass transportation trust fund may provide a text.

Will the States equip their metropolitan areas with the organizational framework and governmental powers that are prerequisites to effective solution of the urban problems? The growth of councils of governments, the Bay Area Government Study in California, the foundation of regional transportation districts in a few places give rise to hope. But the general outcome is uncertain.

In any event, these questions must receive affirmative consideration and, in my view, without delay, if health and prosperity, rather than violence and misery, are to be our legacy to the cities of the future.

Constructive answers to these questions, moreover, are the key to greater participation by private capital in urban redevelopment. And we know that without a larger and more effective input of private entrepreneurial skills and capital the efforts of government will not suffice.

We hear laments about the obsolescence of the transit industry and its failure to foster technological advancement or even to make use of available technologies. But we have not troubled ourselves with the more important issues of how we determine the extent to which these problems can be made to yield to technological change.

We certainly have not identified in any precise way the institutional, social and psychological impediments to the adoption of new technologies and equipment. We need, moreover, to inquire as to what extent changes in institutions, both public and private, and in regulation, taxation, subsidies, and especially in our own habits will alleviate our urban transportation problems or induce innovations.

Let us, above all, not place upon the transit industry the entire burden of modernization and expansion, when the allocations of public resources benefit primarily its competitors, and private risk capital finds more attraction in serving markets created by other technological ventures such as the aerospace industry. While the massive infusion of Federal funds into highways have produced a remarkable system of private transportation, it also tended to discourage comparable effort by the private sector in areas not benefiting from Federal aid.

That public support--call it subsidy if you will--really works is highly attested to by the spectacular achievements of publicly sponsored research in agriculture, nuclear power, health and aerospace, where in each instance substantial Federal expenditure in research and development has given the United States world leadership.

My thought is that this time would be better used today in discussions of critical problems that are yet unsolved instead of upon congratulations on the progress we have made in urban transportation since the last Conference.

We know that:

-- People will use mass transportation if the service is efficient, compatible, safe and timely.

-- Present transit service levels are too often decided by outmoded regulations which seem to consider the customer's demands last.

-- Rail transit will maintain its usefulness in dense traffic corridors and that such corridors can be developed in an exciting way that can add to the amenities of urban life as well as to the mobility of city dwellers.

-- Buses moving over highways will continue to be the primary mode of public transportation in sub-urban America and in medium-sized and smaller cities--and that means most of our cities.

-- A great storehouse of new system alternatives awaits testing and practical application.

But we still do not know much about solutions to the social and economic problems of public transportation, and we are not entirely convinced about what we do know. Unfortunately we do not even know whether we have stated the source of the problems correctly, let alone their solutions. This, I submit, is the urgent task ahead. The moral imperative of providing to all Americans the social and economic mobility now enjoyed by some is the most challenging task of the next decade, and we must begin it now.

The aged, the indigent, the young, and the poor who together represent about one-third of the urban population of this Nation are seriously immobilized because of the deterioration and disappearance of public transportation. Going to the market, to the doctor and the hospital, to the movies, to church, to visit friends and relatives, to the park, to the ballgame and even to a job is now so difficult for many that they are effectively isolated from the general urban society and from the enjoyment of its benefits. Good transportation at reasonable costs is just as necessary to a wholesome life as an adequate diet, comfortable shelter, a good education and satisfying employment.

I am saying also that good public transportation is just as important in Waukesha, Wisconsin, as in New York City or Chicago; just as important in towns of 25,000 as in cities of 5 million and for all people no matter what their circumstances.

Urban mass transportation--and, for that matter, all urban transportation--is important, however, not merely to those who use it. It is important because of its ubiquitous impact on the community. Transportation systems play a large role in determining our life style and the physical structure of our society. When vehicles move, they pollute the atmosphere and create noise, damaging vibration and congestion. When we build highways or transit facilities, we create significant changes in the patterns of activities that go on in the city and in the structure of the city itself. Some areas are made to grow and prosper; others to deteriorate. Jobs, stores, schools, hospitals, theaters, even cemetaries are moved--even destroyed. Some neighborhoods are divided, some isolated from essential services, and others are even created. The entire physical structure of the community reacts to transportation developments.

In short, transportation plays a decisive role in our total urban system--whether we plan it so or not. If it is not convenient, if it is not efficient, if it is not safe, if it is not compatible with the

environment in which it operates, the result is that urban life as a whole assumes the same deficiencies, and is degraded thereby.

The central issues may be simple after all:

-- New systems will not spring up; they require large and substantial public and private support.

-- Fragmented local government lacks the financial capability and the organizational and legal power to go it alone.

-- If we are to have a unified urban transportation system which meets everyone's needs, public resources cannot continue to be allocated as disproportionately as in the past--to the exclusion of urban mass transit.

-- The private entrepreneur will not invest his resources in the development of public mass transit equipment in an environment made hostile by subsidized competition or when the resources and skills which he commands can produce a greater return on his investments in other industries.

-- The private operator will not borrow funds to test new concepts when he is losing his shirt on the old and experiences the psychology of the failing firm.

We can talk here today until we are blue in the face about the wonders of technology and how private industry must be relied on to solve our problem; we can draw beautiful diagrams in color of new system concepts; but we will never get further than the poster and the pamphlet if we do not wake up to the more radical steps that are needed.

We have the best agricultural system in the world because we were willing to invest heavily in research and development to stimulate private innovation.

We are among the healthiest people in the world because we were willing to establish substantial programs of government sponsored research to improve the health of all Americans.

We have the best air transportation system in the world because we were willing to invest massive public support for aircraft research and navigation technology and have been willing to keep building airports and enroute facilities.

We have accepted the need to build comprehensive highway networks with public money over which vehicles developed by private industry can travel efficiently and freely.

And finally, we have reached the moon because we accepted the public burden of financing the venture; but here again it was private industry that provided the product.

The pattern of creation and innovation which characterize these successful ventures of public/private cooperation rest upon the dual condition of massive government support and possible follow-on production volumes which provide a market that can be served by private industry.

In urban transportation our problem and challenge is how to create a similar combination of effective collaborative effort between public resources and private ingenuity and capital. If we accomplish this objective, then we can bring transportation facilities and services into a better balanced and more efficient combination.

Until we are willing to provide adequate levels of public support for funding solutions to our urban mass transportation problems, we may as well stop talking about the creation and application of new technology. Without adequate public support, we will continue to live with inefficient systems, with aggravated congestion, with more noise, with worse air pollution, and with a declining level of service.

Perhaps someday we will realize that we must pay in one way or another for services we demand. I believe mass transportation services are essential to the orderly and good life which we as Americans wish to create in our cities and everywhere. If we as a nation accept this essentiality, then we must accept the financial burden of creating the service.

There is a national effort underway to do something about the problems of our cities. Public and private leaders all agree that America must move without delay on its urban problems of unemployment, housing, education, crime and other needs of our cities. If we--an urban society--are to achieve maximum benefit from the advantages of the world's most advanced economic system, we must include the goal of providing for better levels of transportation services for our cities in this hierarchy of wants and desires.

I am optimistic that we will meet the demands for improved public means that are needed in the search which this Conference has set for its theme. I am confident that the Federal Government will continue its proper promotional role in this effort. I predict that the Department of Transportation will provide the necessary response to the leadership mandate given to it by Congress in July 1968 when the urban mass transportation programs were brought together into a major administration under the Department's jurisdiction.

I make this prediction for one very specific reason: I believe that the new Secretary of Transportation, John A. Volpe, brings to the Department of Transportation a unique experience and understanding of the urgency for developing, as he so aptly stated, "solid, well-thought-out plans for air, rail and highway in conjunction with the rest of the social structure--housing, utilities, schools. . . ."

Only a person who has experienced the transportation troubles of a city can understand the critical nature of our urban transportation problem. Only an urban dweller knows the dimensions of the efforts required both in the public and the private sector for assuring that people and goods move efficiently and economically in our urban communities. Secretary Volpe is from Boston, and I can assure you that his experience as Governor of Massachusetts has well equipped him for playing a major role in the new Administration for rebuilding our cities and making them a better place to live.

The Secretary will need your support in his efforts. I urge you to give him this support and to lend him amply of your talents and resources.

You in Pittsburgh are on the path to solving your own problems. You also can provide the leadership needed by other cities of our country which lack this wealth of talent.